

A¹
51. The method of claim 36, wherein the controllable array of pixel elements comprises a plurality of mirrored surfaces each independently pivotable from a first to a second position.

REMARKS

The following claims 1-51 are currently pending based on amendment herein.

Claims 36-39, 41, 43-49 and 51 are allowed. Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-35, 40, 42 and 50 under U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In independent claims 1 and 24, there is a lack of agreement between the preamble and body principally because the preamble recites a process of making a three-dimensional object, but the body does not positively recite formation of a three-dimensional object.

Claims 40, 42 and 50 are apparatus claims which do not positively recite any apparatus structure and thus, these claims do not further limit the claim(s) from which they depend.

Applicant respectfully traverses the §112 rejections with the following arguments.

35 U.S.C. §112

The Examiner rejected claims 1-35, 40, 42 and 50 under U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner alleges that in independent claims 1 and 24, there is a lack of agreement between the preamble and body principally because the preamble recites a process of making a three-dimensional object, but the body does not positively recite formation of a three-dimensional object.

In response to the preceding 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejections, Although Applicant has amended claims 1 and 24 as per Examiner to clarify the invention, Applicant contends that the body of claims 1 and 24 does positively recite the formation of a three dimensional object.

The Examiner alleges that claims 40, 42 and 50 are apparatus claims which do not positively recite any apparatus structure and thus, these claims do not further limit the claim(s) from which they depend.


In response to the preceding 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejections, Applicant has amended claims 40, 42, and 50 to clarify this invention.

A handwritten signature, possibly reading 'A', is located in the bottom right corner of the page.

CONCLUSION

Based on the preceding arguments, Applicant respectfully believes that claims 1-35, 40, 42 and 50 and the entire application meet the acceptance criteria for allowance and therefore request favorable action. If the Examiner believes that anything further would be helpful to place the application in better condition for allowance, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact Applicant's representative at the telephone number listed below.

Date: 7-9-2002


Arlen L. Olsen
Reg. No. 37,543

SCHMEISER, OLSEN & WATTS
3 Lear Jet Lane, Suite 201
Latham, NY 12110
(518) 220-1850

